**October 7, 2015**

**Plan for phase 2:**

* Have a more decentralized M&E.
* DC team to focus more on evaluation, which will become crucial during scaling phase, and less on monitoring. IFPRI team has comparative advantage and incentives to work on socio-economic research.
* Transfer funds to each mega-site to hire a data manager/M&E project coordinator who will be in charge of insuring the regular monitoring and data sharing. He will collect data from research teams, both on indicators for the PMMT and agronomic/biophysical data for CKAN, communicate on the usefulness of the tool and share evaluation results from IFPRI. He will be the connection between the M&E team and the country teams.
* The 2 new M&E local project coordinators (in ETH and WA) should be mid-level staff with technical skills, who can take care of field activities (BSc., locally recruited)
* Monitoring will focus on:

-SI indicators

-FtF and custom indicators

-beneficiary tracking system

-agronomic-biophysical data

* The local coordinator can also help each team define custom indicators for their own goals and measures of success. S/he will make sure that they are regularly uploaded in the PMMT as custom indicators.

**Feedback from the session participants**

* The team has not tackled E yet, but it has focused mostly on M.
* The research teams would like to know better about which are the learning points from phase 1 that came out of the evaluation effort.
* The research teams need a change of mindset about data management (sharing, uploading, etc.), with the process facilitated and guided by the M&E team.
* IFPRI could communicate better on the common benefits of the sharing platform and to establish a two way support relationship. Some researchers felt that IFPRI requests for sharing data were a bit “extractive”.
* The M part depends a lot, and puts great burden, on scientists. The main problems experienced by the scientists so far have been:
  + oversimplification/underestimation of the efforts required to collect information
  + disconnect between log frames and monitoring requirements
  + challenges in learning
* For phase 2 It would be good that the M&E team communicates early on which data will be asked and what is the use / usefulness of them for the project
* One of the problems during phase 1 was the mismatch of expectations. Deliverables of the M&E team should be clearly communicated at the beginning of phase 2 (especially what will be delivered and the expected timeline).
* It would be good to have a platform where M&E updates and information are shared with the rest of the Africa RISING teams, a blog?
* PMMT training was deemed positive but quite some colleagues could not attend. It would be a good idea to improve the video tutorial with the basic information on how to upload data into the PMMT and CKAN.
* Some researchers are not clear on the difference between M and E.

**October 8, 2015**

**Feedback from the session participants**

* Consistency across SI projects on M&E, and between Humidtropics and Africa RISING. Avoid too many data collections with similar questions – would be good to integrate them.
* M&E system (and its responsibilities) needs to be clear from the onset, and resources must be made available.
* Researchers need to have feedback from IFPRI based on the ARBES data, especially looking at some output (tables, graphs, maps).
* A data confidentiality issue was raised regarding CKAN.
* There was a discussion about the upcoming FTF indicator submission.